

The following article is available online many places, including the following:

EWTN

<http://www.ewtn.com/library/LITURGY/PARACT.TXT>

CMAA

<http://media.musicasacra.com/publications/sacredmusic/pdf/sm117-4.pdf>

Sinfonia Sacra

http://sinfonia-sacra.weebly.com/uploads/1/2/8/3/12837883/skeris_participatio_actuosa.pdf

PARTICIPATIO ACTUOSA IN THEOLOGICAL AND MUSICAL PERSPECTIVE. DOCUMENTARY CONSIDERATIONS

(Reprinted with permission from *Divini Cultus Studium* by Robert A. Skeris. Altötting: Verlag Alfred Coppenrath, 1990.)

The sacrificial death of Jesus Christ the High Priest on Calvary is and will remain the basis for the active participation of the faithful in the liturgy. Membership in the Church, which is brought about by valid baptism, makes one a part of the Mystical Body of Christ, the Priest, to whose priesthood one is interiorly conformed¹ through the baptismal character.

In comparison with the high priesthood of Christ Himself, this priesthood of the baptized is analogous, by an analogy of proper proportionality.² And since confirmation is related to baptism as growth is related to birth, it is clear that the so-called universal priesthood of all believers is ontologically based upon baptism, and not upon the sacrament of confirmation.³ As St. Jerome aptly phrased it, *Sacerdotium laici, id est baptisma.*⁴

From these facts the Church has always drawn the necessary consequences both in theory and in practice. Thus, for example, though there were certain variations in the different liturgical and geographical areas, the basic ways of expressing the participation of the laity in the Eucharist remained in principle the same from the third to the sixth century.⁵ Furthermore, in wide areas of the Frankish kingdom during the sixth and seventh centuries the faithful participated in the liturgical actions and chants.⁶ And from the era of the great Spanish councils of Toledo there are many examples of the participation of the people in their liturgy.⁷ It should be obvious that the ordinary of the Mass offered opportunities for popular participation.⁸

On the theoretical level, F. Holböck has clearly shown that although the theological foundations of active participation in the liturgy were perceived with increasing clarity during the course of the passing centuries, they were never ignored completely, not even in the period between Berengar and the Fourth Lateran Council.⁹

More recent times have witnessed a noteworthy growth of interest in the question of "active participation," especially since the publication of the *motu proprio, Tra le sollecitudini*, of St. Pius X.¹⁰ This document forms the basis of all subsequent papal statements on the subject,¹¹ many of which found a sympathetic resonance in the German language area, above all in student circles and among college graduates, where the German "Quickborn House" at Castle Rothenfels on the Main exercised an important influence.¹² In these groups, external participation was very strongly emphasized, indeed it was taken for granted that everyone would recite the prayers and sing the chants together.

The names of R. Guardini, S. Landersdorfer, J. A. Jungmann and H. v. Meurers perhaps typify developments within Germany during the period between the World Wars.¹³ The initiatives developed in centers like Klosterneuburg, Paris, Antwerp and Maria Laach as well as the international meetings at St. Odilienberg, Lugano or Assisi, for instance, determined to a large extent, through the cooperation of the centers for pastoral liturgy, the entire atmosphere in the years just prior to the last council.¹⁴ And thus when the council was announced, personalities from these centers were at hand to carry out no small part of the preparatory labors.¹⁵ And finally

the first fruits of II Vatican were solemnly proclaimed on December 4, 1963: the constitution on the sacred liturgy, *Sacrosanctum concilium*.¹⁶

Within that section of the preliminary conciliar draft which enunciated the basic theological principles, the subject of *actuosa participatio* was treated chiefly in paragraphs 9 and 14 within the framework of earlier magisterial pronouncements such as *Divini cultus*, *Mediator Dei*, the allocution of Pius XII for Assisi, *Tra le sollecitudini* and the instruction of 1958.¹⁷ In his explanatory *relatio* presented during the fourth general session on October 22, 1962, Franciscan Fr. Ferdinand Antonelli spoke of a *participatio actuosa et personalis*. Some of the observations made in the ensuing discussion are of interest.

The Archbishop of New York, Francis Cardinal Spellman, cautioned against a mere generalization and a purely external participation (*cavendum est a mera divulgatione et participatione tantum externa*) which would only appear to be worship in the Spirit and in the truth.¹⁸

Chiefly in light of his experiences in Berlin, Munich Archbishop Julius Döpfner stressed that the spiritual life depends principally upon a fruitful and living participation in the liturgy (*vita spiritualis praecipue pendet a fructuosa et viva participatione liturgiae*) and expressed his satisfaction that although in principle Latin was to remain the liturgical language, the vernacular could also be permitted, above all where the *salus animarum* or the active participation of the people would make it seem advisable (*ubi salus animarum seu actuosa participatio populi hoc suadet*).¹⁹ The remarks of Raul Silva Henriquez, Cardinal Archbishop of Santiago, Chile, were of greater theological significance. Since the liturgy is the exercise of Christ's priesthood in His members, the Cardinal called for an unequivocal statement about the baptismal priesthood of the laity. Dr. Hermann Volk repeated this request on the following day.²⁰

Archbishop Egidio Vagnozzi then expressed certain reservations, calling the formulations of the schema rather wordy (*saepe verbosa*), more poetic and ascetical than strictly theological (*magis poetico et ascetico quam stricto theologico sermone concinnata*). He gave several concrete examples of this vague and sometimes theologically inexact manner of expression (*sermo theologicus saepe vagus quandoquidem inexactus*). In the subsequent session Cardinal Ottaviani also called for the omission of such ambiguities (*relinquere ea quae ambigua possunt esse, vel obnoxia diversae interpretationi*).²¹

In the fifth general session on October 23, 1962, Cardinal Ritter, Archbishop of Saint Louis, U.S.A., once more called attention to the fact that the task of a liturgical action, at least in part, is to move the *mentes fidelium* psychologically, i.e., to call forth, support and complete in the faithful (*in eis causare, nutrire, perficere*) devotion and interior worship (*devotionem et cultum internum*).²² It may be noted, however, that the means here proposed actually seem less suitable for accomplishing the pastoral goal desired. Instead of speaking about the psychological and spiritual character traits or dispositions of "contemporary man" as *elementum determinativum et normativum* of a liturgical transformation in general, one should—if one is going to speak in sociological terms at all—rather investigate carefully the sociological and anthropological foundations of celebration or feast, for example, or the representative role of the bearers of authority in a community, and only then draw the necessary consequences.²³

As the discussion continued, the Archbishop of Camerino, Italy, Giuseppe d'Avack, urgently requested a precise definition of terms in order to ensure that the conciliar deliberations would bear fruit. In what sense, he asked are we using terms such as "liturgy," and the like? The next speaker, William Cardinal Godfrey, Archbishop of Westminster, supported the demand made by Archbishop d'Avack.²⁴ Re-

grettably, the remarks of these and other fathers went unheeded, and the synod formulated no definitions in the sense of these requests, but rather was content with presenting more or less meager, scanty descriptions.²⁵ Thus J. Pascher was able to enumerate nine different “extensions” of the concept “participation.” Some of them he considered theologically significant (e.g., *scienter, plena, conscia*), others he viewed as less meaningful (e.g., *facilis* or *fructuosa*).²⁶ It is not difficult to understand why this fact continues to be perceived as a deficit. Here is a typical comment:

. . .the crisis which is rocking the Church today is to a great extent the consequence of that council. That is not a reproach directed against the council and its decisions as such; one can rather surmise that these results set standards which were not concrete enough because they were formulated in complicated and wordy texts which therefore require interpretation. . .The concrete statements of the council have practically never reached their ultimate “consumer” in precise and comprehensible form, and hence that which people today claim to understand as “post-conciliar” is really anything but clear.²⁷

In any event, Louis Rastouil, Bishop of Limoges, used clear concepts in his written summary of the theological foundations of the priesthood of Christ as the basis for *actuosa participatio*.²⁸

The result of the discussion up to this point was the addition of the words *vi baptismatis* in the text of the present article 14, precisely in order to state *expressis verbis* the sacramental basis for liturgical participation (*ut fundamentum sacramentale participationis. . .verbis exprimatur*)²⁹

Since human beings are made up of both body and soul, the *actuosa participatio* of human persons is necessarily internal as well as external: the interior element is the “heart” of the matter, which must be expressed in the exterior participation.³⁰ Since the object of liturgical worship is to promote the self-oblation of the faithful as a spiritual sacrifice in union with Christ,³¹ a constantly more profound transformation in Christ is required, in the sense of the Pauline admonition, “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.”³² It may be noted in passing that this *actuosa participatio* may not be equated with concelebration in the strict sense of that term, for two reasons. Firstly, because lay persons lack the sacramental character of orders, and secondly because each participant should carry out all and only those parts which pertain to his office by the nature of the rite and the norms of the liturgy.³³

By way of summary, it may be said that at the celebration of Holy Mass, together with Christ, the faithful glorify God the Father in such a way that

they for their part offer to God the same adoration which Christ offers to the Father, and they unite the glorification which they offer, to that glorification offered by Christ. How does all of this occur? Through the fact that in conformity with the mind and heart of Christ they offer their own spiritual sacrifice of themselves to God, acknowledging Him as their Creator and Lord, adoring Him and giving themselves to Him completely in gratitude and love.³⁴

In this sense one can only agree with the medieval theologians who say that the forms in which the inner adhesion to Christ’s sacrifice are manifested outwardly, are in fact secondary details—provided that the *interior link* is expressed.³⁵

The church musician who is aware of his responsibilities, is by no means a stranger to the many problems connected with *actuosa participatio*. The active participation which expresses itself in the universally comprehensible language of music demands a firm and solid foundation, which must be sought in a faith which shapes and forms one’s whole life.³⁶ Th. B. Rehmann, citing *Mediator Dei*, has strongly emphasized that the concept of a “living” participation³⁷ must needs include the fundamental

human attitude toward the liturgy (and indeed toward divine revelation itself): *ex auditu*, an awefilled hearing, a wondering perception. The living worship community arises only from this deeply interior spiritual receptiveness.³⁸ Before the council ever began, U. Bomm also pointed out that participation in God's redeeming action is a type of mediation. It is from God that the singer receives the words of prayer which he intones, and it is to God that the singer directs his prayerful song—but at the same time he passes this song on to others. Thus the singer shares in the sacramental and liturgical action of Christ and the Church as His interpreter, His herald, His spokesman, as the intermediary who through song interprets the signs of salvation.³⁹

Significant comments were made on this subject during the conciliar deliberations. Thus during the discussion of chapter 7 (6 in the final redaction) of the schema, Bishop Peter Canisius van Lierde, O.S.A., noted that one could not simply ignore the interior participation of the faithful.⁴⁰ The next speaker, Bishop Wilhelm Kempf, agreed, pointing out that the simple designation of *Musica sacra* as *ancilla liturgiae* was inadequate because the essence of liturgical song must be expressed more clearly: *ipse cantus praecise est actio liturgica*.⁴¹ Enrico Nicodemo, Archbishop of Bari, Italy, stressed that interior worship is the origin of the universally comprehensible language of music (*a cultu interno oritur*) and he demanded that the participation of the people be precisely determined (*expresse determinetur*) in order to avoid harmful differences (*ad diversitates vitandas, quae in damnum fidelium cederent*).⁴² Success in this area also depends on musical quality, said Bishop Vincenzo Radicioni of Montalto, Italy. One may not condemn the congregation (*populus in ecclesia condemnari non debet*) to worthless music or songs of the cheapest type under the pretext of "pastoral need" (*sub specie exigentiae pastoralis*). Only a music which attracts the congregation through the power of its beauty, sanctity and general appeal will be pastorally effective. Otherwise the people will turn away in disgust (*a liturgia abhorrebit*) because the music used in the liturgy is inappropriate and banal (*ratione deformitatis seu inanitatis*). Unfortunately, he concluded, this is often enough the case at present.⁴³

After this brief survey of some fundamental theological aspects, it will be opportune to consider several important musical points. The discussion of *Musica sacra* gained much in clarity from the theologically well-founded observations of Jaime Cardinal de Barros Camara, Archbishop of Rio de Janeiro. During the seventeenth general session on November 12, 1962, he stated that *quoad suam naturam*, *Musica sacra* is a *pars necessaria vel integrans* of the solemn liturgy, *quoad actionem* an *ancilla liturgiae*.⁴⁴ The question was further clarified in 1964 at the general assembly of the Federated Caecilian Societies at Brixen, by a conciliar *peritus*: it is of primary importance simply because *agere sequitur esse*.⁴⁵

During the next general session of the council, one of the first speakers was the Primate of Mexico, Archbishop Miguel Dario Miranda y Gomez. He insisted that all must learn to grasp the pastoral task and the goal of the council correctly and completely (*recte et adaequate*) in order to avoid the danger of frustrating the genuinely pastoral purpose by using supposedly "pastoral" means. True pastoral and liturgical progress, he concluded, always brings with it the progress and development of church music as well.⁴⁶

In any discussion of the division of (musical) roles within the Mass, in the sense of "active participation," one repeatedly hears the phrase *partes quae ad populum spectant*. But the problem is precisely to determine which parts "pertain to" the celebrant or the choir on the one hand, and which "pertain to" the participating faithful on the other. J. Pascher dryly observes that "the council, of course, does not settle the question."⁴⁷ The same author opines that here "it could not simply be a

matter of those pieces whose actual performance pertains to the congregation, such as the responses to the acclamations."⁴⁸ On the basis of the greater intelligibility made possible by the vulgar tongue he then attempts to broaden the extension of the "parts which pertain to the people," and among other things comes to the astonishing conclusion that the liturgy constitution considers the recitation and/or singing of the Mass ordinary in the vernacular to be the norm, whereby the Latin form should also not be lost.⁴⁹

However, well-known canonists who have carefully analyzed this problem, such as G. May and H. Flatten, have come to the diametrically opposed conclusion.⁵⁰ And the reluctance with which certain persons accept the unassailable results of such professionally qualified study, is more than passing strange. People simply attempt to minimize such conclusions by casting aspersions on them, calling them "completely mistaken and unchurchly"⁵¹—which surely contributes nothing to the factual explanation of the conciliar texts.

Another attempt at interpreting the concept of *partes quae ad populum spectant* argues from the "principle of functionality" and tries to include the entire ordinary of the Mass, for example, under the common denominator of "acclamation." A typical example may be cited here.

The acclamations, too, pertain to the congregation. These include not just the well-known short responses such as "Glory to you, O Lord" and the like. The *Sanctus*, the *Kyrie* and the *Agnus Dei* are also acclamations, which the composers of the medieval Gregorian melodies—not to mention more modern composers—no longer understood. Hence they pertain to the congregation, as does the *Credo*, which is a profession of faith and hence not suitable for a lyrical and dramatic interpretation such as many composers have given it. The same is true for the hymn, *Gloria in excelsis Deo*.

And thus some do not hesitate to speak about "returning the ordinary of the Mass to the congregation," concluding that "the reform means. . .the end of the complete Mass ordinaries which are sung by the choir alone."⁵² Unfortunately, the partisans of such an extreme view have not yet succeeded in presenting a logical explanation of the glaring contradiction evident between their position and the clear pronouncements of pope and council.^{52A}

The legitimate liturgist may be permitted the following observations:

The statement that the liturgy reform means the end of complete Mass ordinaries which are sung by the choir alone, does not correspond with the facts. For instance, some years ago the diocesan synod of Vienna passed the following regulation with 244 "ayes," 24 abstentions and 9 "nays:"

The ordinary of the Mass can also be sung by the choir, though the congregation may not be completely excluded from singing. In future it is basically no longer permitted to sing *Sanctus* and *Benedictus* compositions straight through the Eucharistic prayer. In order to overcome the resulting problems for traditional church music, after the choir finishes the *Sanctus* the priest sings or recites the epiclesis, the consecratory prayers and the anamnesis. Then the choir sings the *Benedictus*, after which the celebrant sings the concluding doxology of the Eucharistic prayer.

The ordinary of Vienna, H.E. Cardinal König, then made this resolution a diocesan law in accord with the provisions of canon 362 (Code of Canon Law, 1917).⁵³

Referring to the *Sanctus*, the instruction, *Musicam Sacram* of March 5, 1967, states that . . .*praestat ab universo coetu una cum sacerdote, de more cantari.* . .⁵⁴ A correct canonist explains this text as follows:

But *praestat* means that it is more appropriate, it is more apt and opportune, that the *Sanctus* usually be sung in common by the entire congregation. In other

words, no constantly binding norm, as would appear according to the erroneous German translation, but simply an earnest recommendation to conduct oneself so as a rule. Over and above this, the word *praestat* applies only to non-polyphonic Masses, since for polyphonic Masses it is expressly stated in No. 34, Par. 1 of the instruction that they can be performed by the choir *suetis normis*. Making a clear distinction here, No. 34, Par. 2 of the sacred music instruction then continues: *In aliis casibus*, therefore not in the case of a polyphonic ordinary. And only for these other cases is the congregational singing of the *Sanctus* urged.⁵⁵

In the medieval sources it is impossible to find clear proof that the congregation as a whole, for instance during the middle ages, performed prescribed Gregorian chants or recited the texts in common, as is often assumed.⁵⁶

Finally, it is necessary to remind ourselves that according to canon 18 in the Code of Canon Law, 1917 (18 in the Code of Canon Law, 1983), for the textual interpretation of the liturgy constitution we still have at our disposal a legal norm of interpretation in the link between the text to be explained and the intention or mind of the concrete legislator formed before the law was passed.⁵⁷

It will be helpful in this respect to note some of the relevant observations presented during the conciliar discussion. During the eighteenth general session on November 13, 1962, Bishop Peter Canisius van Lierde pointed out that there are certain chants which are meant to be sung by the congregation (*modulationes ad populum destinatae et a populo decantandae*) and others which are to be sung by a choir (*modulationes ipsi choro destinatae*).⁵⁸ This distinction, said the bishop, must be taken into account in any discussion of vocal participation in the solemn liturgy. And in this connection Archbishop Radicioni called attention to another important fact: that the choir has a true and proper liturgical role (*habet verum munus liturgicum, et quidem suum proprium*), which is by no means identical with that of the congregation (*et distinctum a munere populi*). From this we can conclude, with the archbishop, that choral music has its own proper form and substance, distinct from the congregational song (*formam ac substantiam distinctam a cantu sacro populari*).⁵⁹ The foregoing considerations make one thing clear: the conscientious and diligent church musician must not allow himself to be misled by onesided (though today unfortunately widespread) misinterpretations of the conciliar texts.⁶⁰ He is rather called—as is every son and daughter of the Church—to demonstrate through his accomplishments in the service of a truly sacred music, a deep and constructive loyalty to the Church, to her clear commands, her authentic traditions, and her authoritative wishes.

REVEREND ROBERT A. SKERIS

NOTES

1. Cujus sacerdotio configurantur fideles: Sum. Theol. III q. 63a. 3 resp.
2. See A. Graiff, Teologia della partecipazione dei fedeli alla liturgia: La partecipazione dei fedeli alla messa = Liturgica 3 (Roma 1963) 29/62, here above all 43/4. On analogy, see E. Coreth, Analogia entis: LThK I (19572) 468/70.
3. Ita se habet confirmatio ad baptismum, sicut augmentum ad generationem: Sum. Theol. III q. 72a. 6 resp. On this see also Graiff (note 2) 45/50. In order to base the doctrine of the universal priesthood in the Church at least in part upon the sacrament of confirmation, Pius Parsch, for example, interpreted the sacred chrism as “oil of anointing to the priestly dignity:” Bericht über die 2. Volksliturgische Tagung in Klosterneuburg: Bibel und Liturgie 2 (1927/28) 428/50, here 443/7. More recently, another attempt to stress the importance of the sacrament of confirmation in this respect has been made by B. Luykx, Théologie et pastorale de la confirmation: Paroisse et Liturgie 39 (1957) 180/201, 263/78, here e.g. 264, 267. But on the other hand, B. Botte has

pointed out how difficult it would be to find this beautiful idea (une très belle idée) in the church fathers (on ne la trouve pas chez les Pères): BTAM No. 669 (1951) Tome 6/202. See also the apposite remarks of E. Schillebeeckx, *Le Christ, Sacrement de la rencontre de Dieu* (tr. A. Kerkvoorde) = *Lex Orandi* 31 (Paris 1964) 176/88, above all 181/2. However, it cannot be denied that the character of confirmation also includes a *deputatio ad cultum* and is related to the baptismal character. See the overview of the sources presented by A. Robeyns, *Les droits des baptisés dans l'assemblée liturgique*: LMD 61 (1960) 97/130, here 99/107.

4. *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*: MPL 23/166.
5. J. P. Montminy, *La participation des laïcs à l'Eucharistie du IIe au VIe siècle*: *Sciences ecclesiastiques* 19 (1967) 351/72, here 369.
6. G. Nickl, *Der Anteil des Volkes an der Messliturgie im Frankenreiche von Chlodwig bis auf Karl den Grossen*: *Forschungen zur Geschichte des innerkirchlichen Lebens* 2 (Innsbruck 1930) 24/32 on the Sanctus and the Pater Noster, 36/61 on the presentation of the gifts and the kiss of peace, etc.
7. A. Franquesa, *Die Beteiligung des Volkes in der mozarabischen Liturgie*: LL 5 (1938) 243/72, here above all 259/65.
8. See for example the indications given by B. Capelle, *Compte rendus bibliographiques: l'histoire des rites et la participation active à la Messe*: QLP 18 (1933) 169/82.
9. F. Holböck, *Der eucharistische und der mystische Leib Christi in ihren Beziehungen zueinander nach der Lehre der Frühscholastik* (Rom 1941) 215/8, 229/31. See also A. Kolping, *Der aktive Anteil der Gläubigen an der Darbringung des eucharistischen Opfers*. *Dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung frühmittelalterlicher Messerklärungen*: *Divus Thomas* 27 (1949) 369/80; 28 (1950) 79/110, above all 166/7.
10. AAS 36 (1903/4) 329/39. See also G. Lercaro, *Tätige Teilnahme, das Grundprinzip des pastoralliturgischen Reformwerkes Pius X.*: Ljb 3 (1953) 167/74, here 174. Publications on this subject have meanwhile increased to such an extent that it is quite superfluous to attempt even an overview at this point.
11. Cf. the collection of these statements by e.g. P. Theeuws, *Actieve deelname der gelovigen aan de liturgie*: *Tijdschrift voor Liturgie* 46 (1962) 303/13; also A. Mistrorigo, *La partecipazione dei fedeli alla liturgia nel pensiero e nell'opera dei Sommi Pontefici*: *La partecipazione dei fedeli alla Messe* = *Liturgica* 3 (Roma 1963) 11/27. To be consulted with care and a critical sense is the *Diss. theol.* of Stephan Schmid-Keiser, *Aktive Teilnahme. Kriterium gottesdienstlichen Handelns und Feierns* = *Europäische Hochschulschriften* XXIII/250 (Bern 1985) 1/10-125.
12. On this see E. J. Lengeling, *Ernte der liturgischen Bewegung*: *Idem*, *Die Konstitution = Reihe Lebendiger Gottesdienst* 5/6 (Munster 1964) 38*/46*, here above all 39*/41*.
13. See J. Wagner, *Heinrich von Meurers zum Gedächtnis*: Ljb 3 (1953) 5/9.
14. On this see e.g. A. Robeyns, *De actieve deelneming aan de Eucharistie en het pontificaat van Pius XII*: *Tijdschrift voor Liturgie* 41 (1957) 50/61, here 50/3.
15. On this see Lengeling, *Die Konstitution* (note 12) 41/3, 49. Furthermore DOL 77/86 and cf. 20/76, above all 78; A. Bugnini, *La riforma liturgica (1948/1975)* = *EphLit Subsidia* 30 (Roma 1983) 902/20.
16. AAS 56 (1964) 97/138.
17. *Acta synodalia Concilii Vaticani II* (Roma 1970) Vol. I, part 1, 267/9. Hereinafter cited as A/S with volume or part number and pages.
18. AS I/1, 316. The passage cited from the *relatio* is to be found at p. 305.
19. AS (note 17) 320.
20. AS (note 17) 324; 359.
21. AS (note 17) 326; 344.
22. AS (note 17) 351/2.
23. On the subject of "feast" see e.g. J. Pieper, *Zustimmung zur Welt. Eine Theorie des Festes* (München 1963); R. Caillois, *L'homme et le sacré* (Paris 1950); G. Heilfurth, *Fest und Feier*; *Wörterbuch der Soziologie* (Stuttgart 1969) 275/7 with further literature. On role theory, see e.g. R. Dahrendorf, *Homo sociologicus*: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 10 (1958) 178/208, 345/78 with abundant references. Impor-

tant reflections on the representative role of those who bear authority within the Church can be found in W. Siebel, *Freiheit und Herrschaftsstrukturen in der Kirche: Schriften zur Religionssoziologie 1* (Berlin 1971), above all 39/52, 59/69. Such considerations appear to gain significance when one recalls what the archbishop of Durban, South Africa, Denis Hurley (to take but one example), said in the aula of St. Peter's on October 22, 1962: the Church's most important manifestation of herself (*praecipua manifestatio Ecclesiae*) is to be found in the full and active participation of the entire People of God in the liturgical celebrations.

24. AS (note 17) 359; 374.

25. Thus G. Barauna, *Active participation: the inspiring and directive principle of the constitution: Idem* (ed.), *The Liturgy of Vatican II* (Chicago 1966) I/132-93, here 134.

26. J. Pascher, *Das Wesen der tätigen Teilnahme: Miscellanea Liturgica G. Lercaro* (Roma 1966) I/211-29, here 212/4. See also E. J. Lengeling, *Die liturgische Versammlung und die Laien als Mitträger der Liturgie nach dem 2. Vatikanischen Konzil: Jahrbuch des Instituts für christl. Sozialwissenschaften 7/8 = FS J. Höffner (1966/67)* 313/32, here 323, above all note 37. In his written votum, Bishop Biagio d'Agostino of Valle di Lucania pleaded for the qualification "pia" on the grounds that greater piety was the final goal of all efforts at reform: AS (note 17) 590.

27. Thus Theo Lemmer in the *Rheinischer Merkur* no. 52 (December 29, 1972) 20.

28. AS (note 17) 648/9.

29. Thus the *relatio* presented on December 3, 1962, by Archbishop Francis Grimshaw of Birmingham, England: AS I/4, 170/1. This supplementary emendation was accepted with 2096 "ayes," 10 "nays" and 7 invalid ballots. See AS I/4, 213.

30. On this see J. Pascher (note 26) 218/9. The psychological background of this process was described long ago by e.g. Cardinal Mercier, *Aperçus psychologiques sur la participation des fidèles à la vie liturgique: QLP 1 (1910/11)* 4/11, here primarily 10.

31. A. M. Roguet, *Participation in the Mass—the theological principles: V. Ryan* (ed.), *Studies in Pastoral Liturgy 2* (Dublin 1963) 120/37, here 127.

32. Phil 2/5. On this see R. M. Van den Bosch, *Actuosa participatio: Tijdschrift voor Liturgie 40 (1956)* 323/6, here 324. Instructive also D. v. Hildebrand, *Liturgie und Persönlichkeit = Bücher der Geisteserneuerung 4* (Salzburg 1933) 20/4, 37/42. On the spirit of response to value in the liturgy, especially in the affirmative giving of oneself to the Valuable, see pp. 70/102.

33. Cf. H. Lubienska de Lenval, *Un essai de participation à la Messe par le geste et le silence: LMD 8 (1946)* 68/74, here 72. One can of course use the expression in a broader sense, as is done with reference to the 1969 *Novus Ordo Missae* by E. Lodi, *Partecipazione attiva o concelebrazione dei fedeli alla Messa?: Rivista Liturgica 57 (1970)* 127/42, here e.g. 131/2.

34. Thus B. Durst, *Wie sind die Gläubigen an der Feier der heiligen Messe beteiligt?: BenedMon 25 (1949)* 337/54; 417/34, here 432/3.

35. On this see A. Kolping (note 9) 167.

36. See J. Overath, *Zum Jahresbeginn: Musica sacra CVO 80 (1960)* 1/3, here 1.

37. G. S., *Actuosa participatio: CVO 85 (1965)* 161/3.

38. Th. B. Rehmann, *Heilige Musik und kultische Feierlichkeit: CVO 81 (1961)* 18/21, here 20. See also the remarks of Lengeling, *Was besagt "aktive Teilnahme?": Ljb 11 (1961)* 186/8, above all 187/8, whereby the question is whether or not this participation is in fact limited to exclusively interior participation in Rehmann's lecture.

39. U. Bomm, *Kultgesang als tätige Teilnahme am Gotteswerk: CVO 80 (1960)* 5/14, here above all 9.

40. AS I/2, 658.

41. AS (note 40) 659 and see note 44 below.

42. AS (note 40) 740. In this connection one should recall the remarks of Th. Lemmer cited above.

43. AS (note 40) 749. As far as "pastoral needs" are concerned, see the remarks of Archbishop Miranda y Gomez below.

44. AS (note 40) 588. In this context see the present author's remarks in CVO 92 (1972)

- 196/8, here 198. Bishop Kempf also spoke in the same vein as Cardinal de Barros Camara: see note 41 above.
45. Cf. CVO 84 (1946) 194.
46. AS (note 40) 669/70.
47. J. Pascher, Das liturgische Recht des II. Vatikanischen Konzils über die Heilige Liturgie: AfkKr 132 (1963) 385/405, here 396.
48. J. Pascher, Augenblicklicher Stand der Liturgiereform und Ausblick auf das Komende: Liturgiereform im Streit der Meinungen = Studien und Berichte der Katholischen Akademie in Bayern 42 (Würzburg 1968) 43/59, here 46.
49. Pascher (note 48) 47/8.
50. G. May, Umfang und Grenzen des Gebrauchs der Landessprache in der Liturgie nach der Gesetzgebung des zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils: ÖAfKr 18 (1967) 16/94, here 16, 17ff., 58 etc. See also H. Flatten, Zur Rechtslage der Musica Sacra nach dem 2. Vatikanischen Konzil: U. Mosiek-H. Zapp (edd.), Jus et salus animarum = FS Panzram (Freiburg 1972) 171/90, here e.g. 178, 180. This latter text has been published in an authorized English translation by R. Skeris (ed.), Crux et Cithara = MuSaMel 2 (Altötting 1983) 108/21.
51. For instance, see H. B. Meyer, Beharrung und Wandel im Gottesdienst: Liturgiereform im Streit der Meinungen (note 48) 83/108, here above all 103/4.
52. E. J. Lengeling, Eucharistiefeier und Pfarrgemeinde - Aufgaben nach dem Konzil: A. Exeler (ed.), Die neue Gemeinde = FS Filthaut (Mainz 1968) 136/66, here 147, 149.
- 52A. E.g. Sacrosanctum Concilium 112, 114; Notitiae 2 (1966) 292/3; DOL 506: the conservation and promotion of the *thesaurum musicae sacrae* "are evidently not intended to take place outside that environment in which and for which sacred music was born, but rather within the practical liturgical execution. . ."
53. Wiener Synodalbeschlüsse, Abs. V, Die Kirchenmusik, No. 26. Cf. Wiener Diözesanblatt of January 1, 1970, as well as J. Overath (ed.), Magna Gloria Domini: CIMS Salzburg 1972 (Roma 1971) 157.
54. AAS 59 (1967) 310.
55. Thus H. Flatten (note 50) 188.
56. Thus K. F. Fellerer, Soziologie der Kirchenmusik = Kunst und Kommunikation 9 (Köln/Opladen 1963) 27 note 30. See also G. Goller, Die Struktur der Missa Cantata in der römischen Liturgie: J. Overath (ed.), Musica Sacra und Liturgiereform nach dem II. Vatikanischen Konzil (Regensburg 1968) 129/48, here above all 134/41. The matter is well summarized by J. Handschin, Die historische Stellung von Gesang und Orgelspiel im Gottesdienst: H. Oesch (ed.), Gedenkschrift Jacques Handschin (Bern 1957) 161/5, here 161: "Many assume that congregational singing indeed existed in the earliest Christian ages, but that it gradually disappeared in the course of the middle ages, being totally replaced by the song of the clerics. Though it may be correct to a certain extent, the statement is in any case exaggerated, for community singing never died out completely, even in the middle ages. We know that in the larger and more generously endowed churches, the song of the clerics assumed the form of truly artistic singing. But such song is not the product of the exuberant high middle ages, or of the renaissance, for the Church already knew such truly artistic song since the time of Ambrose and Augustine. As this type of song flourished, congregational singing receded into the background during the middle ages, but at no time did it disappear completely. The really new development is that in the middle ages, the organ gradually came into the Church. . ."
57. See H. Barion, Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil. Kanonistischer Bericht II: Der Staat 4 (1965) 341/59, here 358. Now: W. Böckenförde (ed.), Kirche und Kirchenrecht. Gesammelte Aufsätze Hans Barion (Paderborn 1984) 519/37, here 536.
58. AS (note 40) 657.
59. AS (note 40) 750.
60. Dreadful examples of such misinterpretation can be found in e.g. G. May, Deutung und Missdeutung des Konzils: AfkKr 135 (1966) 444/72, here 452ff. See also F. Feuling (ed.), Konzilsaussage und Konzilsauslegung (Zürich 1966), above all 39/64.



SACRED MUSIC

Volume 117, Number 4, Winter 1990

	FROM THE EDITORS	3
	Liturgical and Musical Reforms: An Honest Assessment	
	Faith and Art	
	Altar Girls	
	MEXICO CITY III AND VATICAN II	9
	<i>Duane L.C.M. Galles</i>	
	SIGNS AND SYMBOLS: A REFLECTION	11
	<i>Emilio Higglesden</i>	
	PARTICIPATIO ACTUOSA IN THEOLOGICAL AND MUSICAL	
	PERSPECTIVE. DOCUMENTARY CONSIDERATIONS	15
	<i>Reverend Robert A. Skeris</i>	
	REVIEWS	24
	NEWS	27
	OPEN FORUM	29
	CONTRIBUTORS	30
	EDITORIAL NOTES	30
	INDEX TO VOLUME 117	31